UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/537,047	02/08/2006	Mark Geach	613-96	3193
23117 NIXON & VAN	7590 03/10/200 NDERHYE, PC	EXAMINER		
901 NORTH G	LEBE ROAD, 11TH F	PESELEV, ELLI		
ARLINGTON, VA 22203			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1623	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/10/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/537,047	GEACH, MARK		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Elli Peselev	1623		
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.7 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed n the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>05 J</u> 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowated closed in accordance with the practice under the process of th	s action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pr			
Disposition of Claims				
4) ☐ Claim(s) 16,20-23,31 and 32 is/are pending in 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 16, 20-23, 30 and 31 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.			
Application Papers				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomplished any accomplished and any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 11.	cepted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se tion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ojected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate		

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on January 5, 2009 has been entered.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 16, 20-23, 31 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rorstad et al (European Patent No. 0 466 037) in combination of Lehmann et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,143,883).

Rorstad et al disclose administration of glucans to aquatic animals by oral, aqueous or parenteral administration alone or in combination with vitamins or antimicrobial agents (page 7, lines 37-54) and further disclose that such an administration provides immunostimulating effect (page 3, lines 45-58) but do not disclose a method for the treatment of wound or inflammation. Lehmann et al disclose that water soluble glucans are effective in enhancing immune system and therefore are expected to be effective in accelerating wound healing (column 5, lines 29-35), Lehmann et al further disclose that suitable species to be treated include fish (column 4, line 62). Therefore, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made would have been motivated to administer ware soluble glucans to aquatic animals for the purpose of wound healing, which also includes inflammation caused by said wound.

Applicant's arguments filed January 5, 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant contend that Rorstad et al disclose prophylactic use of glucans in fish and that prophylactic use of yeast does not make obvious that those glucans could be used to treat conditions, such as wounds. The examiner understands that the Rorstad reference in deficient in its teaching of wound treating. That's why the Rorstad reference was used in combination with the Lehmann reference, which does teach the

Art Unit: 1623

use of glucans for the treatment of wounds. Applicant also contends that Rorstad et al does not disclose water soluble glucans. This argument has not been found persuasive since water soluble glucans were well known in the art at the time of the present invention as disclosed by Lehmann et al. Further, note that applicant admits that that he no way claims that water soluble glucans are new. With regard to the mode of administration, applicant states that the term "aqueous exposure" covers a lot more than water immersion. This argument has not been found persuasive because said Rorstad et al disclose administration og glucans via aqueous exposure (page 7, lines 35-45). The terminology "water immersion" encompasses "via aqueous exposure". Applicant further contends that the Rorstad and Lehmann references are not related since the Rorstad reference refers to fish while the Lehmann reference refers to mammals. This argument has not been found persuasive since Lehmann et al also disclose in column 4 fish as suitable species for treatment. Note that the reference's disclosure is not limited to its preferred embodiments. Therefore, the claimed methods are prima facie obvious over the cited prior art.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Elli Peselev whose telephone number is (571) 272-0659. The examiner can normally be reached on 8.00-4.30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Shaojia Jiang can be reached on (571) 272-0627. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/537,047 Page 5

Art Unit: 1623

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Elli Peselev

/Elli Peselev/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1623